



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,642	04/12/2004	Craig R. Horne	3275.06US03	1933
63274 7590 01/29/2009 DARDI & ASSOCIATES, PLLC 220 S. 6TH ST. SUITE 2000, U.S. BANK PLAZA MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
HOFFMANN, JOHN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/29/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte: CRAIG HORNE, JESSE JUR, RONALD MOSSO,
ERIC EUVRARD and XIANGXIN BI

Application No. 10/822,642
Technology Center 1700

Mailed: January 29, 2009

Before TOI JOHNSON *Review Paralegal*
JOHNSON, *Review Paralegal*.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on December 10, 2008. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal.

Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter(s) requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

GROUND'S OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED UPON APPEAL

A review of the file finds that the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal of the claims as provided in the Examiner's Answer mailed September 17, 2008 under the heading "Grounds of rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal" is not consistent with the grounds of rejection of claims set forth in the Final Rejection of record mailed February 5, 2008. The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal as provided in the Examiner's Answer must be consistent with the last Office action of record. *See also Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (MPEP) § 1207.02 (8th ed. Rev. 6, Sept 2007) for details.

Specifically, the Examiner's Answer does not set forth a rejection for claim 48; whereas the Final Rejection finds that claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hicks 4749396 in view of Miller 4501602, Berkey 4684384, Kobayashi 3957474 and Bi 5958348 as set forth on pages 2 and 4 of the Final Rejection.

Clarification of the record is required.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner to:

- 1) vacate the Examiner's Answer mailed September 17, 2008;
- 2) issue a revised Examiner's Answer clarifying the rejection for claim 48 and to correct other sections of the Answer as may be required (if appropriate); or
- 3) issue a form PTOL-90 clarifying the status of claim 48; and
- 4) for such further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

DARDI & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
220 S. 6TH ST.
SUITE 2000, U.S. BANK PLAZA
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402